

1 Overview and Data Model

1.1 Tuesday, August 3, 1999

Anna Leano, Screens and Reports Team Lead, provided an introduction to the session and the participants.

Frank Ernst, WDTIP Conversion Team Lead, presented an overview of the WDTIP. During the overview the following dates were provided to the workgroup. The dates represent important milestones in the conversion plan.

- ☐ Receive Sample County Data: September 10, 1999
- ☐ Receive Sample County Extraction Data: January - March 2000
- ☐ Receive Full Extraction File for Trial Loads: March - April 2000
- ☐ Training of Trainers: April– July 2000
- ☐ County Conversion Loads: May - July 2000

A high-level overview of the data model was presented to the JAD participants by Loc Nguyen, Technical Support Team Lead. During this session, the main relationships between entities were discussed and validated. The discussion focused at the entity level, specifically the time clock tables in the database related directly to the Individual Table (either in a one-to-one or a one-to-many relationship).

2 Business Rules Workgroup

2.1 Tuesday, August 3, 1999

2.1.1 Workgroup Objectives

Anna Leano, Application Team Lead, reviewed the objectives of the JAD session for the Business Rules Workgroup, reviewed the proposed agenda for the three-day session, and facilitated group introductions.

2.1.2 Business Rules/Time Clock Related Data Elements

The workgroup reviewed the prepared business rules, program aid codes list, and exception code type and reason table. Minor modifications were made to the business rules, as detailed below.

TANF and CW 60-month time clocks:

- ☐ It was determined that the WDTIP application should be able to derive program status based on the existence of a program end date. If an end date for a program is present, then the individual's status for that program will be inactive.
- ☐ Capturing the situations when the collection of child support reimburses the aid payment was discussed. Policy determinations are still pending with CDSS.

- ❑ It was determined that supportive services only payments are not normally linked to an aid code and that payment of these services sometimes happens through non-departmental systems.
- ❑ It was suggested that the WDTIP application have a reference table that listed the TANF start dates for all states rather than rely on the individual counties to gather the information. Charissa Miguelino from CDSS was tasked with gathering the information and forwarding it to the WDTIP.
- ❑ A month in which the aid payment is reimbursed by child support collections does not tick the clock for both TANF and CW 60. Exception Code table corrected.
- ❑ Aid code 3P (CalWORKs Cash Grant - Unemployed Parent (linked Medi-Cal) Exempt from Grant Reduction No SOC) added to all CW 60 and WTW 18/24 references.

Diversion:

- ❑ Diversion status code was discussed. Most counties do not currently capture diversion information in their systems. Capture of diversion information may initially be done through an on-line update screen.

18/24-month Welfare to Work clock:

- ❑ The workgroup discussed the possibility of deriving the applicant/recipient flag to initialize an 18 or 24 month Welfare to Work (WTW) calendar based on the county's WTW program start date and the individual's CalWORKs program start date. It was determined that it would not be possible to accurately derive this value and that the counties would be responsible for sending a flag to denote applicant or recipient status at the time the WTW plan sign date was sent.
- ❑ It was agreed to refer to the 18/24-month time clock as the WTW 18/24-month time clock. This will be updated throughout the documentation as well as on the screen display.
- ❑ The workgroup determined that the exception for good cause for Self-Initiated Program (SIP) non-participation should be referred to as an adjustment rather than an extension.

Sanctions:

- ❑ The workgroup determined that only WTW program non-compliance sanctions would be tracked initially.

Child Care:

- ❑ The workgroup discussed tracking of former recipients' potential eligibility to child care benefits for 24 months after the discontinuance of aid. The WDTIP application will flag the 24-month window of opportunity, not the receipt of child care benefits.

ABAWD:

- ❑ The workgroup discussed whether the counties would be required to send ABAWD information to MEDS as well as sending the same information to the WDTIP application. The counties were informed that this issue was already

documented in the project's issue tracking database. It is currently being resolved with HWDC and CDSS.

- It was noted that MEDS does not currently carry an "R" status code to denote that the individual had regained eligibility. More research is needed to determine if/how the application will capture this data.
- The workgroup discussed whether it was possible for a county to have waiver status for only part of the county. Counties indicated that this has occurred in the past and could happen in the future. Since an individual receiving aid in a waiver county is exempt from the ABAWD calendar. The application may include a method to identify a county in partial waiver status. This will be resolved as a component of design.

2.2 Wednesday, August 4, 1999

2.2.1 Conversion Update

Frank Ernst gave the workgroup an overview of what the conversion workgroup had accomplished and addressed some specific issues brought up by Placer County, as follows:

1. WCDS does not use or store CIN.
2. WCDS is already programmed to send ABAWD calendar information to MEDS and does not want to have to change any programming if WDTIP will also be carrying this information. They request the only required change be a rerouting of the information.
3. What fields will be updateable on-line? WCDS would like to be able to correct or override any information that was sent.

2.2.2 Application Overview

Anna presented an overview of the application through a diagram that showed a high-level depiction of the application.

2.2.3 Initial Screen Layouts and Descriptions

Anna reviewed basic system navigation and handed out screen and field descriptions. workgroup reviewed each proposed screen and had the following recommended changes.

Main Menu - Reflect screen name and screen identifier changes for Additional Identity Screen to Alternate Identity Screen and 18/24-month calendar to WTW 18/24-Month Calendar. Screen Id for Time Clocks Summary changed to TSUM. Selection line to read "Select screen number and press enter".

Individual Inquiry - Delineate mandatory fields with an asterisk and show the number of characters and format required for DOB fields. Middle Name field changed to Middle Initial

Individual Response Summary – Header name information changed to be Last, First, MI. This should be the same on all following screens.

Individual Detail – Counties indicated that they report language on a case basis not an individual basis.
ABAWD Indicator will be changed to ABAWD Calendar

Additional Identity – Name change suggested to "Alternate Identity." Screen identifier changed to ALID.

County Summary and Program Summary – No changes.

Program Detail – Changed “Potential Child Care Period” to “Post Aid Child Care Period.” Asterisk to be placed next to Non-CA months to indicate that these months are included in the TANF 60 and CalWORKs 60 months used values. “ABAWD indicator” changed to “ABAWD calendar”.

ABAWD Calendar - No changes.

Time Clocks Summary – Changed screen identifier to TSUM. Changed CalWORKs 18/24 to WTW 18/24. Asterisk to be placed next to Non-CA months to indicate that these months are included in the TANF 60 and CalWORKs 60 months used values. Non-CA months are N/A for the WTW 18/24 clock.

Diversion Summary – No changes.

Diversion Detail – A question was asked about multiple diversion payments for the same diversion instance. Lengthy discussion on diversion ensued. More research will need to be done to determine the effect of multiple payments for the same diversion instance. The system may need to capture and display additional data elements that delineate the diversion instance start and end dates. Sue Wolf will follow up with CDSS to get resolution to the issue. This resolution will drive what information needs to be displayed on the Diversion Detail Screen.

Exception Summary – Changed named to Time Clock Exception Summary and screen identifier changed to TSUM.

Exception Detail – Changed name to Time Clock Exception Detail. Workgroup asked to see Individual’s CalWORKs status on this screen. The status would be either active or inactive based on program participation information.

Navigation – Anna reviewed the general screen flow. The workgroup requested the ability to scroll through all detail records that are attached to a program without going back to the summary screen and making a selection. F7 and F8 will be utilized to view the next or previous viewable record.

2.3 Thursday, August 5, 1999

2.3.1 Training

Carolyn Chang presented the preliminary project strategy for delivering user training and requested feedback from participants.

2.3.2 Reports

Anna reviewed the proposed WDTIP reports on a field-by-field basis to get consensus on what information needs to be available in a report file and the frequency of report generation.

2.3.3 Updateable Fields

The project's approach to updateable fields is to limit the on-line update access to fields that cannot be updated through the batch process. This includes Diversion information, Non-California participation information, Support Services only payments, and Child Support reimbursement information. The reason to limit the fields that can be updated on-line is to minimize the risk of the WDTIP system being out of sync with the County eligibility systems, which should be the system of record.

3 Conversion Workgroup

3.1 Tuesday, August 3, 1999

3.1.1 Conversion Topics

Application Overview:

An overview of the WDTIP system, explaining how the data flows and the external systems that the system will interface with, was presented to the participants. Also, the proposed system and the Pre-SAWS system were compared with regard to data flow. Specifically, the relationship between MEDS, SIS, and SCI was described. MEDS will supply SIS with non-time clock related data, SCI will supply demographic information and CINs for C-III and C-IV counties, and the counties will directly provide updates for mandatory time clock elements.

Conversion Approach

The proposed conversion strategy was described. Several important topics areas were addressed:

1. Initial Conversion: The data that currently exists in the SIS database has been provided through an interface with MEDS. The proposed conversion strategy leverages this data history that has been created and includes two alternatives. Each county would have the option to choose between these two alternatives. The first approach consists of populating data in SIS from the earliest start date that could be provided by the county. We would delete all data from that point forward from the SIS database and populate the database with the new information provided directly by the county. The second option would be to populate all data from the county (back to 12/96 for both cases). Counties will make this determination at a later date (in development).
2. For any data that would remain in SIS after being populated through Pre-SAWS, several issues were identified with the status of that data currently. Specifically, the JAD participants identified that some individuals participating in a case who are over 18 years old may have been participating as a child (and therefore their clocks should not be ticked for eligibility months). To address this issue, the JAD participants suggested including a Participant Code (Adult/Child) for all records we receive directly from the county extraction file. For data that was initially populated from MEDS, it was suggested that the person number may be a means to identify individuals participating as a child. Since many counties have different values to indicate a "child" person number, the WDTIP Team would need to gather these values for every county. Additionally, there was an issue that all counties (i.e., LA) did not use person number in this manner; and therefore, this approach would not address those cases and an alternative would be identified during design.

3.1.2 Assumptions

1	Merced, Ventura (through snapshots of data), and WCDS counties can provide data back to 12/96 on program participation.
2	All systems can provide a participant code to indicate if the individual is acting in the case as a child (or not) moving forward. For preceding data, we can use person number naming conventions, county by county (to be determined for LA Legacy).

3.1.3 Issues

The following issues were identified during the session. These issues will be addressed as a component of the detailed design and tracked in the WDTIP Issue Tracking Log.

1	If CINs are populating from both MEDS and directly from the counties through SIS, is there a possibility that duplicate CINs could be generated for an individual (if MEDS loads after SIS data has been loaded) in SCI?
2	Could the Reconciliation/Renewal process impact the schedule of loading data to SIS? (In some counties, like Merced, they do not send loads to MEDS while they are reconciling with MEDS)
3	Does our load process depend on sync with MEDS (see issues 1, 2) or can we load are data irregardless of the MEDS batch process?
4	Fresno runs on a cycle time that is not necessary the same as eligibility months.
5	Stanislaus- All supplemental payments are tracked on paper.
6	Many systems are not prepared for welfare reform in the format that we are asking for information. The systems do not capture all of the data elements necessary or do not capture the data in appropriate values.
7	Person Numbers (from legacy systems) need to be identified for all counties and included in the derivation of the Participation Code Value.
8	Research is needed to determine if the LA legacy system provided an indicator to MEDS that could be used to distinguish between adults and children.

3.2 Wednesday August 4, 1999

3.2.1 Conversion Topics

Agenda and previous day overview:

The session started by briefly giving an overview of the discussion topics covered the previous day, as well as listing the topics for the morning agenda. The following topics were then discussed, and a decision/strategy was formulated for such topics:

1. Review of Adult/Child Discussion
Two conversion programs will be written to address the counties' needs (described on the previous day's notes). Both options were presented, and all participants representing the counties/consortia identified their counties/consortia with the option that best suited their needs.
2. Program Participation
The grouped agreed that all time clock related data elements, which currently exist for programs that do not affect the timeclocks, such as Medical and Foster Care, will be sent directly to SIS by the counties.
3. Non-Time Clock Data Element Sources
It was decided that data elements necessary for the calculation of time-on-aid would be provided from the counties directly to the proposed application. All other data elements that are needed in order to maintain the Pre-SAWS application functionality will continue to come from MEDS. It should be noted that CIN and CIN maintenance would be provided through an interface with SCI.
4. On-Going Load Conversion Strategies
The preliminary on-going load conversion strategy (which proposed the counties sending full periods of eligibility and "mirror" images of the data to identify changes to data) and associated file format was not to be a feasible strategy to be implemented due to the different ways in which counties store their data. The group, through a brainstorming session, developed a strategy that suited all of the counties needs, as follows: The counties will send effective dates and a status. Based on a business logic, the data would populate into start and end dates (for program participation, exceptions, and non-California aid). In this manner, the counties could send status updates for changes in Aid Codes or change the periods of eligibility itself. The proposed strategy will be used to formulate the business logic that will be contained in the update programs. The counties then used this logic as a basis for generating all of the time clock related elements. This logic is described in the following section.

3.2.2 Data Elements Walkthrough

The group walked through all of the mandatory data elements that will be needed for calculating time on aid in the application. Following is a list of specific data elements or functional areas for which data elements need to be captured.

ABAWD Related Data:

The conversion strategy for ABAWD data will be a duplication of the current process used by MEDS. During the discussion, issues were raised from several county representatives about having to send two extract files, one to MEDS and one to SIS, containing the same data. This issue of duplicating data was proposed as a discussion topic for the WDTIP project management team. The workgroup agreed to maintaining one current ABAWD calendar, which counties would update, and to keep in the SIS database multiple instances of the ABAWD Start Date. The location of this ABAWD data has been listed as an issue.

Child Support

The county representatives expressed their concern of sending Child Support related data to SIS due to the fact that most counties are not currently capturing such data in electronic format. The possibility of having these fields entered in the application through an update screen was discussed. However, this approach would require the existing child support data to be manually entered into the application. Thus, the group decided that a manual conversion was not feasible, especially in the case of large counties such as Los Angeles. This issue of capturing Child Support data was proposed as a discussion topic for the WDTIP project management team.

Diversion

Diversion data is captured different ways across counties. While LA, San Bernardino, and Merced have or will soon have a way to capture this data electronically, all other counties are currently capturing diversion related data manually. Because diversion data represents a very small portion of the total data of the system, the possibility of using an update screen through which to add this data, was considered a feasible strategy by the JAD participants.

Non California Participation Data

The group decided that this data could be captured through an update screen. Los Angeles' LEADER system will electronically capture this data in the future. Once systems have made this move to capture non-California data, the functionality exists in SIS to capture that information through a batch process.

Minor Parent Flag

Counties will provide the Minor Parent Flag along with the program participation. WCDS indicated a concern with supplying this flag because it may not be available in their system.

Discontinuance Reason Code

The group agreed that the reason codes for program discontinuance would be provided when an individual was discontinued. This would not be a mandatory field, but still received directly from the counties.

3.2.3 Assumptions

1	CalWORKS 18-Month Number: data contained in this field will reflect the value that is stored in the county system currently carrying the particular case. Such county may overwrite other counties' data at the time of batch updates. The assumption is that the current county processing this applicant's case is the owner of the data, and their data is the most accurate data. Therefore, there won't be any application logic, besides exception processing logic, to prevent the updating of this field.
2	Workplan Start Date: data contained in this field will reflect the value that is stored in the county system currently carrying this particular case currently. Such county may overwrite other counties' data at the time of batch updates. The assumption is that the current county processing this applicant's case is the owner of the data, and their data is the most accurate data. Therefore, there won't be any application logic, besides exception processing logic, to prevent the updating of this field.

3.2.4 Issues

The following issues were identified during the session. These issues will be addressed as a component of the detailed design and tracked in the WDTIP Issue Tracking Log.

1	The workgroup expressed their concern about having to send ABAWD related data to MEDS and to SIS.
2	Child Support related data is not being captured in a format which makes conversion to SIS possible without having to invest extra resources to manually convert Child Support related data.
3	WCDS is not sure they can provide a minor parent flag with program participation.

3.3 Thursday August 5, 1999

3.3.1 Conversion Topics

Agenda and previous day overview:

The group reviewed the agenda for the last day of the session and briefly evaluated the topics discussed during the two previous sessions. The main topics for the day were:

- ☐ Finishing Mandatory Data Elements Review
- ☐ Other Conversion Topics
- ☐ JAD Recap with the Business Rules Workgroup

3.3.2 Data Elements Walkthrough (continuation from previous day)

Supportive Services

The group discussed the different formats in which the counties are currently capturing Supportive Services related data. Since a considerable portion of Supportive Services data is currently being captured manually, the group identified two alternatives for initial and on going loads into the SIS database. The first option would be an update screen through which counties that currently maintain this information manually could enter Supportive Services data into SIS. Additionally, a batch update process would need to be implemented for the counties that are capturing the data electronically and can send batch updates to SIS.

Penalties

The group determined that penalties don't need to be captured in the new application as they don't impact any of the time clocks. Additionally, the Pre-SAWS application is not currently capturing any penalty information; therefore, penalties were determined to be out of the scope of the WDTIP.

Exceptions

The workgroup discussed the data elements that need to be captured for sanctions as well as batch logic for storing sanctions. Like the program participation logic (discussed on the previous day's notes and below), this information would be "built" using effective dates and status codes.

Effective Date vs. Start and End Dates

Because many county systems do not capture and store a start and end date in their systems, the workgroup proposed that counties send an effective date and status to represent these dates. The workgroup tested this concept through some sample test scenarios to evaluate its validity. The proposed solution of sending an effective date, instead of a start date and an end date, worked well through the proposed scenarios. More details about the proposed logic will be included in the design of the program specifications.

3.3.3 Other Conversion Topics

The conversion workgroup ended the session by discussing several general conversion topics.

Exception Processing

The counties expressed their suggestions for the exception report layout, as well as suggestions on how to make the exception tracking process easier once the reports get to the county. The group expressed their interest in having a way to track each individual exception back to a caseworker at their county. A suggestion was made to tag each incoming record with the user id of the caseworker that processed the excepted record. The user id of the caseworker would not be stored in the SIS database. It would just be returned in the exception report as part of the rejected record so counties can easily track the caseworker that processed the excepted record.

Batch Update Frequency

Another topic discussed was the frequency for the batch update process. For this matter, the group agreed to have daily updates as the target frequency for the application.

3.3.4 Assumptions

1	Penalties' tracking is out of the scope of WDTIP because penalties do not affect time clock calculation and such information is not currently part of the Pre-SAWS functionality.
---	---

3.3.5 Issues

The following issues were identified during the session. These issues will be addressed as a component of the detailed design and tracked in the WDTIP Issue Tracking Log.

1	The Conversion Workgroup expressed an interested in including caseworker in the exception report. A possible solution is to include this attribute to the record header (and not store it in SIS). Research needed to be completed to determine if this suggestion is viable.
2	The participants expressed an interest in having limited access to make on-line updates to all fields in SIS (much like MEDS functionality).

4 Review and Validation

4.1 JAD Session Overview

All workgroup participants came together at the end of the day to briefly give the entire group an overview of the topics that had been discussed during the sessions. The purpose of this last meeting was to allow both groups to hear about what went on during both sessions and ask questions. Frank Ernst (Conversion) and Anna Leano (Business Rules) presented the highlights of their discussions and fielded questions from the participants.

4.2 New Application Name

JAD participants voted on their choice for the best name for the new application. The following are the results of the voting process:

1. TRAC – Tracking Recipients Across Counties (36 points)
2. CAT – California Assistance Tracking (15 points)
3. TIME – Tracking Individual Months of Eligibility (14 points)

After review with project management, a final name will be communicated.